4

8

9

10

a tailored distinct family server, operating in an operating system environment and dedicated to providing access to service requests for the first type of I/O service, receiving and responding to the service request based on
type of I/O service, receiving and responding to the service request based on
type of I/O service, receiving and responding to the service request based on
• -
an activation model specific to the first type of I/O services; and
a processor running an instance of the first type of I/O services that is
interfaces to the file server to satisfy the service request.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the above-referenced patent application as amended herein. Claims 1-3, 9, 15 and 19 have been amended. Claim 14 has been canceled. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1-13 and 15-21 remain pending.

Claims 1, 2, 9-14 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants' admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,537,466 issued to Taylor, et al. (*Taylor*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,908,859 issued to Bennett, et al. (*Bennett*). Claims 3-8 and 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but are otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claims and intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, 9-14 and 16-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants admitted prior art in view of *Taylor* and *Bennett*. Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 3, which the Examiner indicated defines patentable subject matter. Therefore, Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

App. Serial No. 08/435,677 Atty. Docket No. 004860.P1638 Examiner: Perveen, R.
Art Unit 2782

Applicants' amended claim 1 is drawn to a computer system and recites the following:

a processing unit coupled to the bus and running the operating system and applications by executing programming instructions, wherein an application has a first plurality of tailored distinct programming interfaces available to access a plurality of separate sets of computer system services provided through the operating system of the computer system via service requests.

Thus, Applicants claim tailored distinct programming interfaces to access separate sets of computer system services.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that neither Applicants admitted prior art nor Taylor teach or suggest a plurality of tailored distinct programming interfaces. See January 2, 1998 Office Action at page 3, comments 6 and 7. Therefore, whether or not combination of the admitted prior art and Taylor teach or suggest the remaining limitations of claim 1, the cited prior art cannot teach or suggest the claimed invention if Bennett fails to teach or suggest a plurality of tailored distinct programming interfaces to access a plurality of separate sets of computer system services.

Bennett discloses a receiver interface system for enabling an operator to access different types of services in a like manner. See Abstract. The interface allows access to multiple television "services" on different frequencies. See col. 3, lines 48-50. First, Bennett discloses only a single interface to provide access to multiple frequencies. See col. 2, lines 30-48, Table 3 and Fig. 1. Therefore, Bennett does not teach or suggest a plurality of interfaces as claimed.

Second, the services disclosed by *Bennett* are television programming and related services (e.g., audio, video, data in the horizontal and vertical blanking intervals). See col. 2, lines 30-38 and Fig. 2. Therefore, *Bennett* does not teach or suggest access to separate sets of computer system services, as

claimed. Third, Bennett discloses a television receiver interface and not a computer system API interface. See col. 1, lines 24-26. Therefore, Bennett does not teach or suggest computer system services provided through an operating system of a computer system via service requests. Therefore, Bennett clearly does not teach or suggest a plurality of tailored distinct programming interfaces to access a plurality of separate sets of computer system services provided though the operating system of a computer system via service requests.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that no combination of the admitted prior art, Taylor and Bennett teaches or suggests the invention as claimed in claim 1. Claims 9 and 19 recite limitations similar to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 9 and 19 are not obvious in view of the admitted prior art, Taylor and Bennett for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 10-14 and 16-18 depend from claim 9. Claims 20 and 21 depend from claim 19. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 10-14, 16-18, 20 and 21 are not obvious in view of the admitted prior art, Taylor and Bennett for at least the reasons set forth above.

Claims 3-8 and 15 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

Claims 3 and 15 have been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of the claims from which they depend. Claim 2 has been amended to depend from claim 3. Claims 4-8 depend from claim 3.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claims 2-8 and 15 define patentable subject matter.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) have been overcome. Therefore, claims 10-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 4/46 199

Michael J. Mallie Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 36,591

12400 Wilshire Boulevard Seventh Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026 (408) 720-8598